

Appl. No. 09/665,204
Amdt. dated April 27, 2004
Reply to Office Action of January 30, 2004

PATENT

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Amendments

The claims are modified in the amendment. More specifically, claims 1 and 7 have been amended. Therefore, claims 1, 2, 4 and 6-20 are present for examination. No new matter is added by these amendments. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended.

Claim Rejections, Ahuja et al. in view of Lindbo et al.

The Office Action has rejected claims 7-10, 14-16 and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable by the cited portions of U.S. Patent No. 6,175,869 to Ahuja et al. (hereinafter "Ahuja"). Also, the Office Action has rejected claims 1-2, 4, 6, 11-13 and 17-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahuja in view of the cited portions of U.S. Patent No. 6,581,869 to Lindbo et al. (hereinafter "Lindbo"). For a valid rejection, the Office must show that each and every limitation from the claims appears in one or more pieces of prior art. Applicants believe major limitations from claims 1, 7 and 14, in their current form, are neither taught nor suggested in the Ahuja and Lindbo references. More specifically, none of Ahuja and Lindbo teach or suggest: (1) a preference list from a client computer that affects a remote directory as required by claim 1; (2) "a *user-viewable* directory that maps one of the first copy and the second copy to the client computer" as required by claim 7; and (3) content caches that store a portion of a content object as required by claim 14. Applicants respectfully request that the outstanding rejections be withdrawn for at least these reasons.

First Missing Limitation: Client Preference Affecting Remote Directory

Amended claim 1 requires a preference list from a client computer that affects a remote directory. Ahuja teaches a dispatching mechanism 20 that is either remote to the client 12 (e.g., Ahuja, Fig. 2) or proximate the client 32 (*Id.*, Fig. 3A), but in both cases mapping is integral to the dispatching mechanism that would have any preference list (*Id.*, col. 4, line 64 to

Appl. No. 09/665,204
Amdt. dated April 27, 2004
Reply to Office Action of January 30, 2004

PATENT

Fig. 3A). Ahuja cannot be relied upon to teach this limitation, and Lindbo does not teach this limitation either. For at least this reason, reconsideration of amended claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Second Missing Limitation: Directory Being User-Viewable

Amended claim 7 requires "a *user-viewable* directory that maps one of the first copy and the second copy to the client computer." What Lindbo and Ahuja teach is a hidden process of mapping, which is fundamentally different from the *user-viewable* directory we claim. In one embodiment, the directory listing is a web page that displays customized links that are influenced by the preference list to link to one cache or another. Lindbo and Ahuja contemplate not such system that has a *user-viewable* directory, like that of Google™, for example. Reconsideration in light of the amendment to claim 7 is respectfully requested.

Third Missing Limitation: Content Caches Storing Portions

Claim 14 requires that content caches store a portion of a content object. Both Lindbo and Ahuja teach use of mirror sites and not caches. See Lindbo, col. 6, lines 23-38; Ahuja, col. 4, lines 44-48. Mirrors are copies of the original sever and as such do not contain portions of files. As those skilled in the art can appreciate, content files are often very large such that caching portions can have tremendous value in some embodiments of the invention. For at least this reason, reconsideration of the rejection to claim 14 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 09/665,204
Amdt. dated April 27, 2004
Reply to Office Action of January 30, 2004

PATENT

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas D. Franklin
Reg. No. 43,616

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
TDF:cmb

60144012 v1